Case 1:11-cr-00674-NRB Document 57 Filed 04/18/13 Page 1 of 33

D3LMROSS Sentence 1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2 3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 4 11 Cr. 674 (NRB) V. 5 BRUCE ROSENBLUM, 6 Defendant. -----x 7 8 New York, N.Y. March 21, 2013 9 4:15 p.m. 10 Before: 11 HON. NAOMI REICE BUCHWALD, 12 District Judge 13 14 **APPEARANCES** 15 PREET BHARARA United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York 16 JONATHAN COHEN 17 Assistant United States Attorney 18 BRAFMAN & ASSOCIATES Attorneys for Defendant 19 BY: BENJAMIN BRAFMAN JACOB KAPLAN 20 21 22 23 24 25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

(Case called)

MR. COHEN: Jon Cohen on behalf of the government. Good afternoon, your Honor.

MR. BRAFMAN: Good afternoon, your Honor, Benjamin Brafman and Jacob Kaplan for Mr. Rosenblum, who is present for sentencing.

THE COURT: Let me begin, as always, by confirming that I have received everything I should have in connection with the sentence.

> Excuse me one minute. I left something on the desk. (Pause)

THE COURT: In connection with the sentencing I have the report of the probation department with a cover memo dated March 13 of this year and I have sentencing memorandum submitted on behalf of Mr. Rosenblum and the appendix to that sentencing memorandum. Those are all of the documents that I have in connection with the sentence, is that correct?

MR. BRAFMAN: Your Honor, I agree that's correct. With respect to Mr. Rosenblum, there was a covering letter from me to your Honor that came with the courtesy copy to the Court. I have an extra copy.

THE COURT: I don't recall seeing that. refreshes me that there is right in front of me another document that I have, and that is a letter from Mr. Rooney, Terrence Rooney, who is Mr. Rosenblum's therapist at St. Mark's 1 Place.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

That's correct. Our letter references MR. BRAFMAN: the need to get either a court order or direction from the Court, but we have solved the problem. If I can have my copy back. I want to make sure the government has a copy as well, but I believe it was served on both your Honor and the government at the same time.

THE COURT: I should say that I spoke to a senior person at probation. I don't now remember exactly who I spoke to, who said it was contrary to the practice of the probation department to have therapists who they had contracted with come to court and testify.

MR. BRAFMAN: They opted for the letter.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. BRAFMAN: We sought quidance from your Honor. didn't want to do anything that was inappropriate. We thought the information was relevant on the issue of sentencing.

THE COURT: Let me just confirm, Mr. Brafman, that you've received a copy of the probation officer's report?

MR. BRAFMAN: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Have you had a chance to review it with Mr. Rosenblum?

MR. BRAFMAN: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you have any objections to it?

MR. BRAFMAN: There was some previous objections

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

They have been accepted and they were ministerial in filed. nature and they have all been corrected.

THE COURT: Mr. Cohen, did you receive a copy of the report?

> MR. COHEN: Yes, your Honor.

Do you have any objections? THE COURT:

No objections. MR. COHEN:

It would be hard not to get the thrust of THE COURT: the submission on behalf of Mr. Rosenblum from the 48-page letter and the stack of exhibits.

If it would be all right, I would like to begin with a question for Mr. Cohen.

MR. BRAFMAN: Sure.

THE COURT: This case, both with respect to Mr. Rosenblum and his codefendant, Mr. Nicosia, sort of have a quality of just springing up in very little context. understand how the government came to learn about Mr. Rosenblum through the cooperative efforts of Mr. Nicosia. But what is very much missing from my perspective in trying to figure out what an appropriate sentence here is is learning something more about Mr. Rosenblum's criminal activities, which I assume he needed to tell you about in order to get the benefit of safety valve.

> MR. COHEN: May I have a moment, your Honor?

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. COHEN: Judge, so there is the conduct that the government knew about prior to safety valve proffers and there is conduct that we learned in questioning of Mr. Rosenblum.

Mr. Rosenblum did sell drugs to Mr. Nicosia. You'll see that reflected in the plea agreement. The Ketamine that's reflected there, large quantities, and the methcathinone, the analogue of 4-MEC that's reflected there, those were both drugs that he was selling to Mr. Nicosia. The cocaine comes in through sessions with Mr. Rosenblum. Mr. Rosenblum initially wanted to cooperate with the government and was very forthcoming and engaged in multiple sessions with the government, a total of four sessions, and the government declined to extend a cooperation agreement to Mr. Rosenblum.

THE COURT: Mr. Rosenblum or Mr. Nicosia?

MR. COHEN: Mr. Rosenblum.

THE COURT: So you declined for both of them, actually?

MR. COHEN: Yes. But in Mr. Rosenblum's case it was not based on the government's concerns about credibility. It was based on other reasons. So some of the information that's come to light from the government's perspective is from the sessions and some of it is from the drugs. For instance, the Ketamine, the methcathinone, those are substances that the DEA took custody of and tested. And the cocaine is coming in based on representations by Mr. Rosenblum in order for him to qualify

for safety valve relief.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

1213

14

15

16

17

18

1920

21

22

2324

25

THE COURT: Let me try it again. What is the street value of these drugs? How big an operation is this? How long was he engaged in it?

MR. COHEN: Can I have a moment, your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes.

Judge, for the drugs that Mr. Rosenblum MR. COHEN: was caught with, approximately \$50,000, that is about half of the Ketamine and about half of the methcathinone. Because equal quantities were on his person and had previously been provided to Mr. Nicosia approximately equal quantities. was seized with about half of the Ketamine and about half of the methcathinone that's listed in the plea agreement. My understanding from the defense is that the street value of that was approximately \$50,000. The cocaine can range, a gram could be \$40, \$50, gram level quantities, you know, and usually even more than that. And then wholesale quantities, kilo of cocaine could be anywhere from \$30,000 to \$40,000, depending on the situation, and I believe the quantities of cocaine were significantly less than a kilo, 226 grams, about a quarter kilo, your Honor.

THE COURT: Remind me what you said about, the cocaine comes into the picture because --

MR. COHEN: Because the government asked Mr. Rosenblum to be candid about his history of drug dealing. And aside from

D3LMROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the classes of drugs that he was arrested with, he also dealt cocaine in the past and told us of the quantities of cocaine that he had dealt.

THE COURT: And is there any information about how long Mr. Rosenblum had been involved in drug dealing?

MR. COHEN: From memory, your Honor, it was quite a few years.

> THE COURT: Mr. Brafman, let me give you the floor. MR. BRAFMAN: Thank you.

Your Honor, I want to start where I did not think I would start from, but since the Court asked specific questions, let me at least begin there.

I had not intended to have my remarks focus at all on the facts because I can see that the facts are bad. This is a drug case. It's not a good drug case. The defendant was a drug addict. And his dual addiction to gambling and drug addiction fueled his involvement in criminal activity. We have been candid with the Court about that. He has been candid with probation.

And to his credit, some of what the government learned about Mr. Rosenblum came from Mr. Rosenblum when the government didn't know anything about it, and I think that's all part of the process of trying to make amends and trying to do what's right and trying to help yourself when you suddenly realize that you need to turn your life around. So I concede that the

facts are bad.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The question is, what do we do with that and where do we go with that? I want to respectfully note for the record, since the Court mentioned Mr. Nicosia, your Honor will recall that the Court imposed an 18-month sentence in the case of Mr. Nicosia. And I just want to point out the distinction, which I think is a huge distinction. Mr. Nicosia's case, the Department of Probation recommended 57 months. The Court imposed 18 months for family circumstances and a variety of reasons. I'm not quarreling with the sentence, but I do want the Court to recognize that what I saw in the defendant's probation report I very rarely have seen, especially in a report prepared by a seasoned veteran where the probation officer concludes that the probation is very impressed with the defendant's postarrest efforts towards rehabilitation and believe that his enthusiasm is sincere. That's a statement to your Honor that I think is made by an objective, independent officer of the Court or at least independent arm of the Court. And I think that's a powerful statement, that with Mr. Nicosia, who is the one who set up Mr. Rosenblum, for using street language, if I could --

THE COURT: Only in his arrest, not in his criminal activity.

MR. BRAFMAN: I understand that. In that case it was Mr. Nicosia who assisted in the arrest of Mr. Rosenblum, and

1 the I

the Department of Probation recognized that in his case a recommendation of 57 months was appropriate.

THE COURT: Let me just tell you candidly, I tried to reach the probation officer earlier because, for the life of me, I cannot figure out why the probation officer made the recommendation with respect to Mr. Nicosia and made the recommendation with respect to Mr. Rosenblum. And, honestly, to be really candid, I don't think they are that different. I think there are enormous parallels between these two people.

And I'm sorry I couldn't reach her. I don't know what her thinking is. But, as I say, I don't understand the difference.

MR. BRAFMAN: I don't want to speak out of turn and I'll let the government address this. I think if you were to inquire, I think the government would concede that they are very different people, Mr. Nicosia and Mr. Rosenblum, and that Mr. Nicosia, who had an opportunity to cooperate and did cooperate, at least with respect to Mr. Rosenblum, did not earn a 5K agreement because at some point the government was disappointed in his credibility, if you will.

With respect to Mr. Rosenblum, who came in on four separate occasions, my understanding, proffered honestly, not just to obtain safety valve, but proffered honestly. The cooperation agreement was not offered because he did not have any useful information to provide. There was never a conclusion that he wasn't being honest. I think that's a huge

difference.

THE COURT: Let's go through some of the similarities. They are roughly the same age, they both got involved in criminal activity as a result of both drug and gambling addictions. They both started their own businesses, which at some point came to an end. They both have failed marriages under sort of dramatic circumstances. Mr. Nicosia, as soon as he was arrested, turned his life around and not only turned his own life around, but turned around the life of his four kids.

You know, in the case of Mr. Rosenblum, I recognize he has family, but not family he is responsible for in the same way that Mr. Nicosia was responsible for his kids. And I think the same arguments about post hope rehabilitation apply to Mr. Nicosia. You may be aware, you may not be, I don't know, that his wife was so debilitated, shall we say, by her drug addiction that he was given custody of his children while he was under federal indictment for a narcotics case. That is, I'm thinking, in both of our experiences, pretty unusual.

MR. BRAFMAN: I agree.

THE COURT: He took kids that were failing, he took care of them and got them to be good students. And so, frankly, I don't really understand why Ms. Tyler saw these two people so dramatically differently. That doesn't mean that I think either of them should have gotten the guidelines sentence. And that's why I was trying to ask Mr. Cohen, who

didn't submit a letter with respect to Mr. Rosenblum but had with respect to Mr. Nicosia, to give me some greater sense of the background. I understand why you don't want to discuss the criminal activity of your client. That's fine. He has pled to it.

But the question is, as I have to decide what the appropriate sentence is, I also have to really get a sense of the extent of his criminal activity. And this case is a little bit unusual because, even going back to the complaint, you know, to try to learn something more about it, okay, the government has a confidential informant. They arrest

Mr. Nicosia, they find some drugs in his house. He gives up

Mr. Rosenblum. They find some drugs on his person and some in his house. It's like a presentation in a box and most of the time cases don't just arrive in boxes, and that's really the reason that I'm trying to learn a little bit more.

MR. BRAFMAN: Your Honor, if I may, and, obviously, your Honor's concern concerns me because it is my hope to still be able to persuade you that a sentence of incarceration is not appropriate in this case, even though in your Honor's mind perhaps starting this dialogue you see the defendant is very similarly situated. I think there are a number of distinctions. It's my understanding, your Honor, that the record in this case of extraordinary postrehabilitation efforts is not disputed by anybody, and I think part of the reason

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

there is no response in writing from the government is I think that they don't dispute the fact that in the last 18 months this defendant has done everything possible --

THE COURT: Mr. Nicosia did, too. He did it not just for himself. He didn't just clean up his act. He behaved as a truly responsible parent and helped his four kids get back on track.

MR. BRAFMAN: To his credit I think that's all obviously very good. But I think in this case what we have added to the equation, if you will, is the question of whether or not a prison sentence under these circumstances, as to this defendant, who is currently engaged in the extraordinary rehabilitative efforts, would do good or more harm than good. And I respectfully submit that based on the facts in this case, a sentence of probation with as a condition of probation that the defendant continue in therapy is appropriate for a number of reasons that I'd like to address.

First and foremost, I think the literature is clear that a sentence of probation is punishment, but, more importantly, it keeps the defendant on a very short leash before this Court. And to the extent that the trust your Honor will put in him is misplaced and that he doesn't continue in therapy as required or does anything wrong, you always have the opportunity to sentence him within the next several years, and I don't think that will ever happen.

But what I do have and, to be honest with you, Judge,
I did not ask the people who are in this courtroom to come. To
the contrary, when it was suggested that all of the people
involved in Gamblers Anonymous, in the room he goes to several
times a week and times several times a day, wanted to come, I
was trying to discourage it. And, yet, after the fact, I think
I was wrong. And I think the letters that we have from many of
these people are painfully eloquent as to what we are
requesting, and it's what they are requesting. And I know your
Honor has read everything.

I just want to read a very brief portion of one from -- I am going to preserve the anonymity for the public record of these men and women, even though many of them have signed their full name. Exhibit 17, which is a letter from Mike, asks your Honor for probation, and you say why. And I'm quoting: If he were to attend GA meetings for the rest of his life telling his history to new members, that would be a positive thing for his recovery and others as well.

Even if your Honor, and I'm stopping reading now, even if your Honor were to feel that he doesn't deserve it himself, the fact is that in the past 18 months, Bruce Rosenblum has begun to have a dramatic positive effect on a number of people who now look to him for guidance as a new recovering addict. And some of the parts of these letters that are extraordinary, your Honor, these are written by people who have been in

Gamblers Anonymous, some of them for 30, 40, 45 years. This is a lifetime of recovery, a lifetime of addiction. And my hope would be that not be any interruption.

I think perhaps one of the most eloquent pleas comes from Exhibit 25, which is written by an individual named Larry. And at the end, asking your Honor to keep him in the program, he closes his letter with the following sentence, the last line of Exhibit 25: Please leave him with us and trust we will watch him closer than any prison will.

So the question I have, and I think what we have done in the submission, we have cited to every case that we could find in this jurisdiction and others where courts in this courthouse and across the bridge and in other jurisdictions have concluded that postoffense rehabilitation is a powerful argument.

THE COURT: We don't disagree about that.

MR. BRAFMAN: Judge, several years ago I was on a sentencing panel with some of your colleagues from other courts and I asked the question I've always wanted to ask of judges. If I'm before a judge who I know has read everything, the chances are fairly good that he or she has probably made up their mind when they come on the bench. Should I go through the exercise of having this impassioned, and they said yes, and you have to do it for a couple of reasons. One, because you're an advocate and it's your ethical responsibility. Two, in the

case of someone like Bruce Rosenblum, who I think has extraordinary redeeming qualities, it may help the Court, it may move the Court. And even if it doesn't, he deserves the public record, not just the bad stuff, but the good stuff and in this case what I think the extraordinary. I am not going to belabor these issues.

THE COURT: I don't think I have ever cut someone off at sentencing.

MR. BRAFMAN: You have not and I'm not suggesting you do. It's clear to me that I'm climbing a steep hill.

THE COURT: You're climbing the hill. I'll be very candid with you. I gave his codefendant 18 months. I took a father out of his house, I put him in jail. I took him away from his kids. I left his kids with his 63-year-old, if I remember, 18 months away from retirement by putting his kids into his mother's house. Her father, who was widowed, could not come and live with them. And there is something, and I think you'd agree, at least in the abstract, to balance within a case and proportionality within a case.

Now, perhaps it would have been better if everyone got sentenced on the same day, and I could have read both sets of sentencing submissions. But, generally, when the sentence actually occurs, it tends to not be something that I fully control. You're asking for pure probation and you made an argument in your brief which I just don't agree with, that they

are dramatically different. I think they are incredibly similar. I'm being very honest with you. That's where I'm coming from.

MR. BRAFMAN: I appreciate the Court's honesty. I'm not pleased by the honesty, but I appreciate the honesty.

THE COURT: Better off knowing what I'm thinking.

MR. BRAFMAN: Judge, I'm open to having this discussion. I read the language in Jones where the Court is required to look at each individual in the unique human complexity. And I think that despite the fact that you might have a right to conclude in the abstract, perhaps, that they are very similar, I don't think they are. And I think there is a distinction within a difference and I think Bruce Rosenblum, in his unique position right now, in the midst of extraordinary therapy, has a shot at being a productive citizen. And I think he has a shot at continuing in therapy.

And you, your Honor, always have the right to change your mind if he doesn't fulfill my expectations and his expectations because probation does keep the defendant before the Court, unlike Mr. Nicosia, who I think was remanded prior to sentence, required to surrender. Mr. Rosenblum was not. Unlike Mr. Nicosia, who was not credible with the government, at least in full, Mr. Rosenblum was.

So to the extent that they are not perfectly exactly alike, I don't think the Court is bound to give Mr. Rosenblum

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the same sentence that was imposed on Mr. Nicosia with a sentence that's similar, and I don't think there is anything inappropriate or illegal or an abuse of discretion to conclude that this defendant has demonstrated to the Court -- put the criminal conduct over here -- has demonstrated to the Court with compelling, uncontroverted evidence that he has done an extraordinary job at rehabilitating himself, and in the opinion of experts, he is on the road to a full recovery. You interrupt that recovery, whether it's 18 months or a year and a day or six months, and you get no therapy, you get no treatment, and the worst thing for a recovering addict is to be placed in the company of bad influences. That's the first mantra at any 12-step recovery program. Stay away from people who are bad influences. The statistics that I have recently read is that 60 percent of the people in federal custody are there because of some involvement with narcotics that many people even in jail continue to be involved in narcotics.

Right now we know where he is. He is home. He is with his family. He is in front of the courtroom. They have a family unit that is taking care of him. He is taking care of them. He is working full time for the first time in a long time as an employee earning his own living, running a very, very honest existence, a clean existence. I just don't want to break that. And I certainly don't want to break it because the Court feels that you must sentence him to the same sentence

that Mr. Nicosia received. I think there are differences and I think he is worth taking a gamble on.

And I want to say something else, Judge. I'm not Mr. Nicosia's lawyer and I'm not trying to either defend or attack the sentence that the Court gave to Mr. Nicosia. But if the Court had imposed a sentence of probation in that case I think I would have a very easy argument today on the issue of sentence parity.

So rather than me having to be burdened, if you will, by a sentence that I had really had nothing to do with and could not help convince the Court to not impose, I'm now in a position where I have to essentially defend the sentence that was imposed in the case of Mr. Nicosia, and I see them as very different people.

And I see that from the cases we have all been reading, since Booker and Gall and the Supreme Court and when we are arguing for a 3553 variance, the language that we get is punishment should fit the offender, not merely the crime. And in this case I have an offender who has worked diligently, exceptionally well.

I have 70 people in the courtroom who are begging you to let him continue in recovery. That's very unusual. I have been in this building for more than 30 years. I usually have the family and maybe some friends. These people were not asked by Bruce to come and they certainly weren't encouraged by me to

come. This is part of the process. We help you. We take care of you. We try and convince a Court that you are worth the risk of giving some extraordinary leniency to.

I just want to read two quotes from cases that I believe your Honor certainly recognizes. They are in our submission and they are from judges who I know this Court has great respect for.

One was a quote from Judge Sweet in the Maier case where he gave a sentence of probation to a woman whose guidelines were 51 to 63 months. The government appealed and the Second Circuit went back and said, we are going to affirm the sentence by Judge Sweet. This is the quote from the Court which appears at page 41 of our submission. The district court conscientiously examined all of the pertinent circumstances, including the nature of the defendant's addiction, the characteristics of the program she has entered, the progress she is making, the objective indications of her determination to rehabilitate herself, and her therapist's assessment of her progress toward rehabilitation, and the hazards of interrupting the progress.

I think, Judge, what we are supposed to do is impose a sentence that's sufficient but not greater than necessary to promote respect for the law. I think in this case, as to this defendant, if your Honor was to conclude, as I'm begging you to conclude, that this defendant's therapy is quite remarkable and

I am going to err on the side of caution and allow him to continue in that therapy so that we hopefully don't interrupt therapy that's working, I think that's a good sentence. I don't think it's a sentence that imposes anyone to ridicule or criticism and it certainly doesn't promote disrespect for the Court. I don't think anybody in Mr. Rosenblum's position would consider a sentence after 18 months of rehabilitative efforts where the Court said, you know, I am going to take a chance on you and I am going to let you continue in your rehabilitation and I am going to accept this argument.

What I would like to read to you is the quote from
Judge Gleason in the Zimmerman case. Because if I wrote this
myself in this case, I think this is what I would be writing to
your Honor if I had the wisdom and eloquence of Judge Gleason.
It's at page 43. In my view, even taking into account the
seriousness of the defendant's offense, imposing a more onerous
form of punishment, that is, a period of years or even months
in prison, would pose an undue risk of wiping all of the
defendant's hard work away, disserving not only him and the
family, but the community as well. A sentence of supervised
release will allow the defendant to continue the positive path
he is on. It strikes me as counterproductive to remove the
defendant from his current circumstances and delaying his
further progress while he sits in prison.

Let me continue below, skipping a few lines: The

defendant is not the same person today as when he sold crack.

He would not likely be the same person after a lengthy term of imprisonment as he is today. He could easily lose the positive attitude he currently has and fall back on old bad habits. I think that's the case.

THE COURT: Are you really telling me that

Mr. Rosenblum's family, now that it is 100 percent clear what

he has been doing for the last 20 years of his life, whatever

he hid from them, whatever they chose not to see, that they

would ever let him slip back into that habit. The fact is, he

does have a lot more support out there than a lot of people

that come before me for sentencing.

MR. BRAFMAN: The support doesn't work by itself without the therapy and the program. And interrupting the program for six months or a year and a day or 18 months, he has to start from the beginning if he doesn't relapse while he is there.

THE COURT: He can't get drugs and he can't gamble.

MR. BRAFMAN: Your Honor, most respectfully, I have lectured on the problem in the Bureau of Prisons. The Bureau of Prisons, one of the biggest problems is use of drugs in their facility and use of gambling to create all sorts of problems. They deal with it every day. The problem we have is, there is no supervision for this — the only thing you can't do in the prison for the most part is leave. Other than

that, it's really up to a creative juices of a prison surrounded by other prisoners who are going to teach you how to work within the institution. The case that was in this courthouse, Michael Douglas' son, Cameron Douglas, represented by a whole team of very good lawyers, he has been remanded over and over again for getting drugs while he's in jail. And his 24-month sentence ended up as ten years and he is serving it in maximum security in segregation.

Your Honor, I'm asking you, Judge, most respectfully, I understand exactly what you are saying. And I'm not looking to fight with you. Someone asked me how I spent my day. I said, well, today, I'm going to be begging. That's how I am going to spend my day. I want to help him. I want to save him. I think he's worth saving. I think he can be saved.

And I think the only thing, in my opinion, that maybe is stopping you from being more receptive is the fact that you've already imposed the sentence in the Nicosia case. You thought it was the appropriate sentence in that case and I don't think you are bound to give the same sentence to this defendant because judges, for a variety of reasons, and I think you can look at the cases we cited, when there is an issue of sentence disparity, the courts can justify it and in this case I think you can justify it. You don't need to justify it. I think you can explain it.

You have before you a defendant who is gainfully

employed, who is working very, very well towards recovery, who is surrounded by 70 people who came all the way to court to tell you that they are going to stay on his case to remain in recovery. You have a probation department who has made an extraordinary distinction by itself as to their own view of this defendant, and they have independently concluded that his rehabilitative efforts are sincere and that he is making progress.

All I'm asking you, Judge, is not to disturb the present by taking him out of the therapy and recognizing that it's not as if you will never have the ability to correct this sentence, should you conclude that you made a mistake because he has relapsed or because he has done something wrong. Probation is restrictive. It would require him to work, require him to stay in therapy, require him to continue in all the efforts that he has made to date.

I'm asking you, your Honor. I don't know what else I can say. And I'm happy to respond to any additional questions. I am hopeful that what your Honor will recognize is a passionate advocacy by someone who has great respect for the Court and also great care for my own credibility in this courthouse. We have put an enormous amount of time and effort into this case and have concluded in our own mind, and I'm not a witness in these proceedings, but you can tell from our submission that this is a real person who is trying his best to

2

straighten out his life.

3 Ju
4 ma
5 th
6 Ho

6 Hono

8

7

9

1011

12

13

15

14

1617

18

1920

21

2223

24

25

And when you look at the discussion by Judge Gleason,
Judge Sweet, by Judge Weinstein in the Eastern District, by
many of the Courts throughout the country who have discussed
these very same issues, I think they can all confirm that your
Honor has the right to impose a sentence of probation,
discretion to do it, and can rely on the facts that we have
provided for a good-faith variance from the sentence that would
be imposed if the guidelines were mandatory. We don't have to
reach any departure arguments.

I would also note that Mr. Nicosia was required to plead guilty to a crime that had a maximum sentence of 20 years.

THE COURT: Do they have the same guidelines? He had no mandatory.

MR. BRAFMAN: I understand that. But that's a recognition by the government that they were dealing with different people, if you will, your Honor. Mr. Rosenblum pled guilty to a crime with a maximum of ten years. And I have not been able to either speak with the probation officer as to why she made the distinction, but I think that's an important distinction. This is a seasoned probation officer. This is not a kid.

THE COURT: I am not sure you are right about that.

Mr. Cohen can tell me. I thought that ultimately Mr. Nicosia

pled to a lesser-included offense.

MR. COHEN: I believe he was charged in a (b)(1)(B) with a five-year mandatory minimum based on the quantity of cocaine, 1001 grams that was seized at the time of his arrest. So I do believe he faced a more serious charge at the outset.

Your Honor is completely correct that the guidelines range is identical. And the substances that Mr. Rosenblum was caught with, Ketamine and methcathinone 4-MEC, do not have mandatory minimums associated with them.

Finally, the amount of cocaine to which he pled is approximately, I believe it was -- 230 grams is less than the threshold, the 500-gram threshold for cocaine. But you are correct, your Honor, that he pled guilty to a lesser included. So the five year was not operative.

THE COURT: In the end there was no mandatory minimum. The guidelines were identical.

MR. COHEN: I should correct what I just said, your Honor. The mandatory minimum was not applicable due to the safety valve in Mr. Nicosia's case.

MR. BRAFMAN: That's correct. Mr. Nicosia pled to a mandatory minimum five-year count and then that was avoided as a result of the safety valve. So then even in the charging instruments the government made the distinction between the defendants.

MR. COHEN: Judge, I just found the letter. I believe

it was a (b)(1)(C), after all.

criminal history categories of I.

2

3

THE COURT: I just don't think that there was a mandatory.

4

5

MR. COHEN: I think you are correct. I found his sentencing, the letter I submitted in Mr. Nicosia's case. I'm happy to hand it up to your Honor. It clarifies.

6 7

THE COURT: I actually have your letter.

8

MR. COHEN: It's at the bottom of page 2, your Honor.

9

THE COURT: In the end there was no mandatory minimum.

MR. COHEN: Judge, very briefly, this was a difficult

10

They both had the same base offense level of 25. They both had

11

12

13

Mr. Cohen, does the government want to add anything at this point?

14

case that the offense is serious, the drugs are serious. You

16

15

know, Mr. Rosenblum was selling to Mr. Nicosia, Mr. Nicosia was $\,$

reference to earlier. But at the same time, you have evidence

17

selling to another individual that your Honor has made

18 19

before you, persuasive evidence that the defendant will not

20

recidivate. Neither one of us know whether that's the case or

21

not, but certainly that is one of the vast distinctions between

22

before you that he would not recidivate is consistent with how

the two defendants. I would say that the evidence you have

24

25

manner. My recollection is that he came in for two sessions

the cooperation process went. He cooperated in a timely

first and was informed that the government didn't believe he could offer substantial assistance.

Mr. Rosenblum kept telling his lawyer to schedule additional sessions to discuss other conduct, knowing full well there were no promises and that the government had told him in no uncertain terms that a cooperation agreement was not a possibility. So in that sense it's not a unique case in that sense. That does happen in other cases at times. But it's not the common situation of, as soon as a defendant sees that that's not in the works, just abandoning that strategy whatsoever. And so, you know, that to me seems consistent with his turning over a new leaf, basically, from the start. That's all I'd like to say.

THE COURT: Did you have some reason to think that Mr. Nicosia was going to return to criminal conduct after he was arrested, immediately cooperated with you and then demonstrated responsible parenting to a really exceptional degree, I thought? You were here. We met his family. We met his kids.

MR. COHEN: Your Honor, I had serious questions about Mr. Nicosia's credibility. And any time you have a defendant who you believe to be lying, it's a different situation than defendants who are forthcoming. Perhaps one of the reasons that defendants lie is because they think they can get away with it, and sometimes I'm sure they can. But that's got a

totally different feel than someone who is offering information over and over again and doesn't seem to be at least picking his spots about what to tell the truth about and what not to tell the truth about.

THE COURT: Mr. Rosenblum, you have a chance to speak, if you wish.

THE DEFENDANT: Thanks, your Honor.

My name is Bruce Rosenblum. I'm a recovering addict. I do apologize to my family and my friends for my conduct. In the past 16 months I have worked hard. I've gotten support through therapy and through my GA brothers and sisters. And I have had opportunity to see the bad mistakes that I have made and the bad decisions that I have made.

In the past couple of months I've been feeling good about a possible good future and I've been working hard at it.

And with the help of people from GA, therapy as well, I hope to have a good future. I'm asking your Honor to please give me a chance at continuing in my recovery. Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Rosenblum, don't you have the faith in yourself that if you were sentenced to a period in jail that you have really internally turned the corner and that you are never going back to the life of crime and addiction that you have followed for so many years?

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, I'm very comfortable in saying that I'm going to work hard and not going back to any of

my addictions. I'm comfortable in saying I will not go back to my addictions. I am also comfortable saying when I was within my addictions, the things that I have done and the way I reacted, I couldn't imagine. I came in not even realizing what I was doing, how I was doing it.

For the past 18 months, through hearing other people's stories, through listening, through having the opportunity to have a therapist one on one, for getting close to my family again, it's been amazing to me to actually see that life could go on in a good fashion.

I can't tell you, your Honor, that putting me in jail is going to be a good or bad thing for me. I don't know. What I can tell you was, beforehand, I made a lot of mistakes and I was caught up in my addictions. And right now I'm doing everything, and I mean everything, I can to try to have a good life.

THE COURT: But, you know, going forward, in the end you can only rely on yourself.

MR. BRAFMAN: Judge, can I make an observation?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. BRAFMAN: There are men and women in this courtroom who have been in Gamblers Anonymous 45 years straight, and every one of them will tell you that if they stopped going they would probably relax back into an addiction tomorrow. It is a lifetime of work and effort, and only with

continued, relentless therapy and support can they cross over that addiction. This is not an illness that you take antibiotics and five days later you are cured.

THE COURT: I don't think I'm quite that naive.

MR. BRAFMAN: I don't mean that, your Honor. I'm saying Mr. Rosenblum is now in a place where he is succeeding. And all we are asking is that you not remove him from that place to a place where the odds of him relaxing are greater, much greater than they would be if he were to continue in treatment.

And the only reason I mention the people here who have 45 years is, it's a statement that is extraordinary when you think about that they are members of GA for 45 years. This is the future that he has if his therapy isn't interrupted, to continue to deal with that. It's far more severe a sentence of work that he has to do for the rest of his life. And I'm asking your Honor to take a chance.

And I think the government, very honestly, and I commend Mr. Cohen. I don't know him, but consistent with the Southern District, he is an honorable man. He told you what I think is the difference and that is enough, if your Honor wants to vary the sentence imposed on Mr. Nicosia. He told you very eloquently just a minute ago that this man, who you are about to sentence today, was truthful from the beginning, throughout, and Mr. Nicosia was not, and that's a marked distinction.

We have all been in cases where when the guidelines were mandatory, a cooperation agreement, if you will, could earn someone nonjail sentence when the guidelines would expose you to 120 months. And in this case what he told them didn't earn him a cooperation agreement. Not because he lied, but because he didn't have any information that they needed or that they could use. There is a big difference between not getting a cooperation agreement because the assistant you are dealing with doesn't trust you or finds you lying or untruthful. And I think that's a sufficient distinction, if your Honor is inclined to give him the benefit of a more lenient sentence. It certainly helps all of the other arguments that I think are themselves valid and compelling.

THE COURT: Did you want to say anything else?

MR. BRAFMAN: No, Judge.

THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: I am going to take a brief recess.

(Recess)

THE COURT: We have talked a lot this afternoon about the codefendants in this case. And as I've indicated numerous times, I think there are meaningful similarities between them. At the same time, there are distinctions between the defendants, even though personally I find Mr. Nicosia's personal circumstances more compelling.

But the reality is that I don't know the defendants as

well as the prosecutor does and as defense counsel get the
opportunity to learn.

So I find myself guided by the view of the government that a noncustodial sentence is not objectionable here. I find sufficient arguments have been presented that cause me some concern that incarcerating the defendant will interfere with the positive path he is on, and I'm heartened by the outpouring of the support in the courtroom on which I must place considerable trust.

Accordingly, the defendant is sentenced to time served and placed on supervised release for three years. There is a special assessment of \$100 and all of the mandatory, standard, and special conditions set out at pages 27 and 28 are imposed.

Mr. Cohen, are there any open counts to dismiss?

MR. COHEN: There are not, your Honor.

THE COURT: I believe that the defendant waived the right to appeal the sentence.

MR. BRAFMAN: Yes.

THE COURT: Is there anything further?

MR. COHEN: Just for the record, your Honor, our position is that a guidelines sentence is appropriate. I felt it very important to clarify the difference between the defendants. But that is merely for the record, your Honor.

THE COURT: After the discussion I don't really know what that means.

MR. BRAFMAN: Your Honor, first of all, on behalf of Mr. Rosenblum and his family and all the people in the courtroom and on behalf of myself and my associate, we put a lot of time in this case. We want to thank you for the trust and the compassion that you've obviously extended in this difficult proceeding.

At the risk of being ungracious, could I address an issue on bail. For the Passover holiday the government has no objection, the defendant be permitted to travel to his brother's home in St. Louis for four days during the holiday and give the government the itinerary.

> THE COURT: Sure.

MR. BRAFMAN: Thank you very much, your Honor.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, thank you very much.

THE COURT: We don't clap in a courtroom. It's not good manners. Leave silently. Whatever party you want to have, you can have outside.

MR. BRAFMAN: Thank you, Judge.

000

25